DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 271 UD 027 482

AUTHOR	Edwards, Nancy; And Others
TITLE	Chapter I: Neglected or Delinquent Program.
INSTITUTION	Houston Independent School District, Tex.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	21p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; *Child Neglect; Compensatory Education; *Delinquency; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutionalized Persons; Program Evaluation; *Student Characteristics; *Tutorial Programs; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Texas (Houston)

ABSTRACT

This evaluation of the 1988/89 compensatory education program for neglected or delinquent youth in Houston found that all youth referred to the program had been tested for eligibility but not all those eligible received services. The program is funded under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act and offers tutorial services designed to assist students residing at ten participating institutions to overcome their educational deficiencies. Evaluation information was collected from teacher and tutor service rosters, site visits, and structured interviews with personnel. The following findings are reported: (1) of the 987 students served, 62 percent were male, 46 percent were black, 77 percent were between the ages of 14 and 17, and 81 percent were in the seventh through the tenth grades; (2) 51 percent of the students were tutored in both reading and mathematics, 11 percent were tutored in reading only, and 14 percent were tutored in mathematics only; (3) 23 percent of the students tested for eligibility were not tutored because they did not remain in the institution long enough to receive instruction; (4) all students referred for tutoring were tested for eligibility; (5) 93 percent of the students at nine of the institutions received tutoring but 57 percent of the students at one institution were not tutored; and (6) teachers perceived that the program helped most students but the students' non-academic problems made it difficult for them to improve their academic achievement. Statistical data are included on four tables. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323271

Chapter I:
Neglected or Delinquent Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kathryn Sanchez
Houston Independent School District
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Houston Independent School District
Department of Research & Evaluation

Edwards, Nancy, M.A.
Cisneros, Elda, M.A.
Sanchez, Kathryn S., Ed.D.

Joan M. Raymond
General Superintendent

UD 027 482

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program

Final Report 1988-89

Chapter 1 Research

Program Description

This program offers tutorial or full-time teacher services designed to assist students residing at participating institutions to overcome their education deficiencies. The institutions for delinquent children participating in this program during the 1988-89 school year were: Burnett-Bayland Home, Harris County Youth Village, Harris County Juvenile Detention, Hope Center Supervised Apartments and Progressive Adolescent Learning Services (PALS); while the institutions for neglected children were: Chimney Rock Center, Covenant House, Crittenton Services (DePelchin), Family Connection and Houston Achievement Place.

The program objectives read as follows:

Objective 1: All students who have been referred for the Chapter 1 program will have been tested (or had their available test scores examined) to determine their Chapter 1 eligibility.

Objective 2: All Chapter 1 eligible children who have remained in residence after testing will have received Chapter 1 instruction, provided that there is room in the program.

Funding Sources

The Neglected or Delinquent program was financed through federal funds authorized by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA). The program cost $111,168, which was less than 1% of the total Chapter 1 expenditures of $20,217,752. A total of 987 students were served. Of these, 761 or 77% were tutored for two hours or more at a cost of $141.48 per student, while 226 or 23% were tested but not tutored. The estimated cost to test one student is $15.00 for one hour of the teacher's time and $.50 for one test. The estimated total cost for the 226 students who were not tutored is $3,503, or 3% of the total Neglected or Delinquent expenditures.

Evaluation Objectives

This investigation was designed to provide answers for the following research questions:

Research Question 1: How many students participated in the tutorial program and what were their demographic characteristics?

Research Question 2: Were all students who were referred to the Chapter 1 program tested to determine their Chapter 1 eligibility?

Research Question 3: Did all students who remained in residence after testing receive Chapter 1 instruction, provided that there was room in the program?

Research Question 4: What were the tutor's perceptions of the impact of Chapter 1 instruction on students' academic performance?

Executive Summary (continued)

Methods

Information on all the students in the program was included in the evaluation The evaluation design included the collection of service rosters from the tutors and teachers, site visits to all 10 institutions, and structured interviews with Chapter 1 personnel.

Results

Research Question 1: The 987 students served in the Neglected or Delinquent program were predominantly male (62%), Black (46%), between the ages of 14 and 17 (77%), and in the seventh through the tenth grades (81%). Fifty one percent of the students were tutored in both reading and math, 11%were tutored in reading only and 14% were tutored in math only. Twenty three percent were tested but not tutored because they did not remain at the institution long enough to receive tutorial instruction.

Research Question 2: Access to institutional records is legally limited for reasons of confidentiality, and so the Chapter 1 Research Specialist was not able to examine them. As far as is possible to determine from Chapter 1 records alone, all students who were referred for tutoring, according to institutional procedures, were tested.

Research Question 3: Independently verifiable information was not available on the following questions: the length of time a student was at the institution after he or she was tested, and whether there was room in the program at that time. On the basis of information from the service rosters, 93% of the students at nine of the institutions received Chapter 1 instruction, but at Chimney Rock Center 57% of the students were not tutored.

Research Question 4: The teachers' perceptions were that the academic assistance they were providing was helpful to most students. However, they also felt that their students' major non-academic problems (their neglected or delinquent status) often made it difficult for them to improve their academic achievement.

In Conclusion:

Objective 1 was met.

Objective 2, as written, was not met.

DESIGN OF THE INQUIRY

The purpose of this inquiry was to examine the impact of the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Tutorial program on the students who were served in 1988-89.

The specific tasks for this inquiry were:

- To describe the demographic characteristics of the students who were served.
- To assess the impact of the program on the students' academic achievement.

This investigation was designed to provide answers for the following research questions:

Research Question 1: How many students participated in the tutorial program and what were their demographic characteristics?

Research Question 2: Were all students who were referred to the Chapter 1 program tested to determine their Chapter 1 eligibility?

Research Question 3: Did all students who remained in residence after testing receive Chapter 1 instruction, provided that there was room in the program?

Research Question 4: What were the tutor's perceptions of the impact of Chapter 1 instruction on students' academic performance?

MOTIVATION FOR CONDUCTING THE STUDY

Why was this study conducted?

Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Program:

The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA) established a Chapter 1 program to provide supplemental remedial instruction in reading/language arts and mathematics for students residing in institutions for neglected or delinquent children. This legislation replaced the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I) which had provided funds to serve the same student population.

This report presents information collected during the 1988-89 academic year as mandated by Federal guidelines and the HISD Chapter 1 proposal. It includes documentation of attainment of program objectives, the number of students served in the program, the nature of services provided, and the results of a tutor survey.

This report evaluates the following objectives as specified in the program proposal:

- All students who have been referred for the Chapter 1 program will have been tested (or had their available test scores examined) to determine their Chapter 1 eligibility.

- All Chapter 1 eligible children who have remained in residence after testing will have received Chapter 1 instruction, provided that there is room in the program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

What was the Chapter 1 Neglected or Delinquent Tutorial program?

Institutional Participation: In order to participate in this program, a neglected or delinquent institution must apply directly to the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Funding is based on the number of students who are residing in the institution during October of the previous year. These funds are then allocated to HISD for disbursal.

Services: The tutorial program at each institution was designed to accommodate the students' age group and the mission of the institution. The groupings below were based on whether the students were attending a regular HISD middle or high school (9%), attending a school within the institution (81%), or not attending school (10%). The sites where services were offered are listed below.

Burnett-Bayland Home offered tutorials on a flexible schedule after students attended regular HISD schools during the day. The tutoring sessions ranged from 30 to 60 minutes two or three days per week, with a group size of five or fewer. *Houston Achievement Place* contracted with Sylvan Learning Center, a privately-owned tutorial service, to tutor their students after regular school hours. They were tutored one to two days per week for 60 minutes in groups no larger than three.

At *Harris County Youth Village* a teacher taught remedial reading in small groups in which students were, as much as possible, on the same reading level. Classes met for 55 minutes per day as part of the regular school day. Chapter 1 also paid for the services of a part-time psychologist who counseled 75 students for one or more sessions of individual or group therapy

Chimney Rock Center, Covenant House, Crittenton Services (DePelchin), Family Connection, and Progressive Adolescent Learning Services (PALS) have a school within the institution which offers instruction to all students during the morning. Tutorial was offered in the afternoon or evening for students who were below grade level. The tutoring sessions ranged from 60 to 90 minutes, two to five days per week. Students were tutored in groups of ten or fewer.

Harris County Juvenile Detention Center and *Hope Center Apartments* offered tutorials to students who were not enrolled in any other school. At Hope Center the tutorial program prepared students to take the GED (General Education Diploma) examination. Students were tutored individually from 30 minutes to two hours, once or twice per week. At the Harris County Juvenile Detention Center students were tutored in reading/language arts and math individually for an hour per day, five days per week.

Number Served and Cost: The Neglected or Delinquent program cost $111,168, which was less than 1% of total Chapter 1 expenditures of $20,217,752. A total of 987 students were served. Of these, 761 or 77% were tutored for two hours or more at a cost of $141.48 per student, while 226 or 23% were tested but not tutored. The estimated cost to test one student is $15.00 for one hour of the teacher's time and $.50 for one test. The estimated total cost for the 226 students is $3,503, or 3% of the total Neglected or Delinquent budget.

METHODS

How was this study conducted?

Sampling: Information on all students in the program was included in the evaluation. Students residing in these ten institutions typically have educational deficits which qualify them for the Chapter 1 program. Students who qualify for this program must be overage for grade or score below grade level (below the fortieth percentile) on the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT).

Data Collection: The evaluation design included the collection of service rosters from the tutors and teachers, site visits to all 10 institutions, and structured interviews with Chapter 1 personnel. Each teacher/tutor was asked to submit service rosters which contained: student name and ID number, date of birth, grade, gender, ethnicity, WRAT test level, reading score and math score, subject in which the student was tutored, and HISD campus number, if any. Information from the interviews and service rosters was collected and frequencies were calculated.

What were the limitations of this study?

Institutional Diversity: These institutions and the residents they house are so diverse that no one outcome measure could be applied to them all. The ten institutions can be divided into five institutions for the neglected and five for the delinquent, but these two groups remain highly diverse. Among the five institutions for the neglected, three are 30-day shelters (Chimney Rock Center, Covenant House and Family Connection) which house runaway children as either the main or a secondary group of residents. The other two programs can not be grouped together since Crittenton serves pregnant unmarried teenagers and Houston Achievement Place is a residence for children aged 10 to 17 who have been abused or neglected by their parents. Among the five delinquent institutions: Harris County Youth Village and Progressive Adolescent Learning Services could be called residential schools; Burnett-Bayland is a residential program from which students attend regular HISD schools; Hope Center Supervised Apartments is a residential program for youth who are working outside the institution; and Harris County Juvenile Detention houses youths who have been arrested and are awaiting Juvenile Court action.

Institutional Records: The students' institutional records are not routinely made available to the tutors. They are not made available to the evaluator because of legal requirements for confidentiality. The tutors keep their own records but they do not necessarily know when a student has been admitted to the institution; they only know when a student has been admitted to their program. They generally do not know ahead of time when a student will be discharged or dismissed, as these plans are usually only disclosed at the last minute to avoid disruptive behavior on the part of the student.

Program Duration, Goals, and Follow-up: Because students enter and leave unpredictably, this program can not be evaluated using a pretest-posttest design. Tutors set goals for their students which can be attained in a brief period. If a student was in school before being admitted to the institution, the goal is to return them to school when they leave. If a student is 16 years of age or older, does not wish to return to school, and already has mastered sufficient academic content, the goal is to coach them to pass the GED. Students who do not fit into either category work on either survival skills or reading and math improvement. Of the students at all the institutions in the program who were tutored, 63% were tutored 2-21 hours, 26% were tutored 22-61 hours and 11% were tutored 62 hours or more (equivalent to three months or more of service at the rate of one hour per day, five days per week).

The institutions either do their own follow-up or they release their students into the Juvenile Probation system. These follow-up records presumably contain information on how many students returned to school, passed the GED, entered the work force, or are continuing their education while incarcerated. Because records of this follow-up have not been made available to the evaluator, program outcome was assessed with a tutor questionnaire.

Testing for Program Eligibility: There are a number of difficulties associated with using the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) to qualify students for this program. This test is also used by Juvenile Probation, Mental Health and Mental Retardation, and other programs that these students may have previously passed through. By the time they take the WRAT for Chapter 1, they often have taken it on several other occasions and can score above their ability level because of their familiarity with the test. At the same time many students score artificially low because of their unwillingness to participate in any educational program. The virtue of this test is that it is low in cost and takes 20 to 30 minutes to administer. The use of an expensive diagnostic test can not be justified due to the short duration of the Chapter 1 program.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

How many students participated in the tutorial program and what were their demographic characteristics?

Table 1: Distribution by Ethnicity and Sex for the Neglected or Delinquent Students who Received Services in 1988-89

Institutions	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Male	Female	Total
Delinquent							
Burnett-Bayland Home	12	35	26	-	73	-	**73**
Harris County Youth Village	10	44	22	1	70	7	**77**
Harris County Juvenile Detention	13	60	16	-	87	2	**89**
Hope Center Supervised Apartments	6	5	3	-	5	9	**14**
Progressive Adolescent Learning Services (PALS)	-	27	5	-	32	-	**32**
Neglected							
Chimney Rock Center	109	144	59	2	139	175	**314**
Covenant House	130	92	35	1	153	105	**258**
Crittenton Services (DePelchin)	7	10	2	-	-	19	**19**
Family Connection	42	33	20	3	54	44	**98**
Houston Achievement Place	7	3	2	1	2	11	**13**
TOTAL	**336**	**453**	**190**	**8**	**615**	**372**	**987**

Table 1 Trends:

1. The 987 students served in the Neglected or Delinquent program were predominantly male (62%) and Black (46%). Burnett-Bayland Home and Progressive Adolescent Learning Services (PALS) do not admit females while Crittenton Services does not admit males. All seven of the remaining institutions are predominantly male, except for Chimney Rock Center where females comprise 56% of the participants.

2. The largest percentage of participants were White at four institutions: Covenant House, Family Connection, Houston Achievement Place, and Hope Center Supervised Apartments. At the other six institutions the largest percentage were Black.

Table 2: Distribution by Grade for the Neglected or Delinquent Students who Received Services in 1988-89

	Grade Last Attended										
Institutions	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**Total**
Delinquent											
Burnett-Bayland Home	-	2	2	5	14	19	23	8	-	-	**73**
Harris County Youth Village	-	-	2	9	26	16	24	-	-	-	**77**
Harris County Juvenile Detention	-	1	2	4	5	12	32	23	7	3	**89**
Hope Center Supervised Apartments	-	-	-	-	1	1	5	4	3	-	**14**
Progressive Adolescent Learning Services (PALS)	-	-	-	3	6	6	14	3	-	-	**32**
Neglected											
Chimney Rock Center	-	1	18	39	72	92	55	28	9	-	**314**
Covenant House	1	1	4	12	32	57	58	56	29	8	**258**
Crittenton Services (DePelchin)	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	5	6	2	**19**
Family Connection	-	-	-	7	15	16	38	14	8	-	**98**
Houston Achievement Place	-	-	1	-	-	5	7	-	-	-	**13**
TOTAL	**1**	**5**	**29**	**79**	**171**	**230**	**261**	**142**	**58**	**9**	**987**

Table 3: Distribution by Age for the Neglected or Delinquent Students who Received Services in 1988-89

	Age in 1988											
Institutions	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**20**	**Total**
Delinquent												
Burnett-Bayland Home	-	2	2	10	15	21	18	5	-	-	-	**73**
Harris County Youth Village	-	2	1	6	21	27	14	6	-	-	-	**77**
Harris County Juvenile Detention	-	4-	3	2	10	22	37	11	-	-	-	**89**
Hope Center Supervised Apartments	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	9	-	-	-	**14**
Progressive Adolescent Learning Services (PALS)	-	-	-	3	9	11	6	3	-	-	-	**32**
Neglected												
Chimney Rock Center	1	9	47	59	77	71	36	12	2	-	-	**314**
Covenant House	1	2	16	23	35	40	76	59	6	-	-	**258**
Crittenton Services (DePelchin)	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	7	5	2	2	**19**
Family Connection	-	-	3	11	15	26	35	8	-	-	-	**98**
Houston Achievement Place	-	-	1	-	5	3	3	1	-	-	-	**13**
TOTAL	**2**	**19**	**73**	**114**	**188**	**221**	**231**	**121**	**13**	**2**	**2**	**987**

Trends from Tables 2 and 3:

1. Participants at these ten institutions predominantly attended middle school and to a lesser extent, high school. Their ages were between 14 and 17 (77%), and in the seventh through the tenth grades (81%). Six of the institutions have participants who are in elementary school.

2. The grades with the largest numbers of participants were grades 8 and 9, while the ages with the largest numbers were 15 and 16. This is an indication that many students are older than is typical for their grade. Large numbers of overage students were found in 1987-88 and 1986-87 as well.

Table 4: Distribution by Number and percentage of Hours Tutored for the Neglected or Delinquent Students who Received Services in 1988-89

Institutions	Tested Only		Tutored		Number of Hours Tutored 2-21		22-61		62 or more		Total
Delinquent	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	
Burnett-Bayland Home	9	12	64	88	23	36	31	48	10	16	73
Harris County Youth Village	-	-	77	100	10	13	25	32	42	55	77
Harris County Juvenile Detention	4	4	85	96	44	52	32	38	9	10	89
Hope Center Supervised Apartments	-	-	14	100	14	100	-	-	-	-	14
Progressive Adolescent Learning Services (PALS)	-	-	32	100	12	38	9	28	11	34	32
Neglected											
Chimney Rock Center	180	57	134	43	111	83	23	17	-	-	314
Covenant House	26	10	232	90	182	78	48	21	2	1	258
Crittenton Services (DePelchin)			19	100	2	11	13	68	4	21	19
Family Connection	6	6	92	94	78	85	14	15	-	-	98
Houston Achievement Place	1	8	12	92	6	50	6	50	-	-	13
TOTAL	**226**	**23**	**761**	**77**	**482**	**63**	**201**	**26**	**78**	**11**	**987**

Table 4 trends:

1. Fifty one percent of the students were tutored in both reading and math, 11%were tutored in reading only, and 14% were tutored in math only. Twenty three percent were tested but not tutored because they did not remain at the institution long enough to receive tutorial instruction.

2. The institutions with the largest percentage of students participating for one month or less (2 - 21 hours) were the three 30-day shelters: Chimney Rock Center, Covenant House and Family Connection.

3. Only four institutions had more than 10% of their participants stay in the program for more than 3 months: Burnett-Bayland Home, Harris County Youth Village, Progressive Adolescent Youth Services (PALS), and Crittenton Services. The total number of these students was 67, or 9% of all the students who were tutored.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

Were all students who were referred to the Chapter 1 program tested to determine their Chapter 1 eligibility?

Access to institutional records is legally limited for reasons of confidentiality, and so the Chapter 1 Research Specialist was not able to examine them. As far as is possible to determine from Chapter 1 records alone, all students who were referred for tutoring, according to institutional procedures, were tested. Thus, the first objective was met.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

Did all students who remained in residence after testing receive Chapter 1 instruction, provided that there was room in the program?

The second objective is only partially assessable because independently verifiable information is not available on the following questions: length of time a student was at the institution after he or she was tested, and whether there was room in the program at that time. On the basis of the information available, the second objective was met except at the Chimney Rock Center.

The only institution to test significant numbers of students who were not subsequently tutored was Chimney Rock Center, where 57% of the students were not tutored. The typical residential stay at this institution is less than one month.

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

What was the impact of Chapter 1 instruction on students' academic performance?

An effort to obtain outcome information was made using structured teacher interviews. Tutors and teachers were asked to give their opinion of the results their programs were achieving. Eleven of the 12 Chapter 1 teachers and tutors responded. To summarize, they felt that the academic assistance they were providing was helpful to most students. However, they also felt that their students' major non-academic problems (their neglected or delinquent status) often made it difficult for them to improve their academic achievement.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As a result of this study, what are the implications for practice?

The findings of this study suggest the following implications for program planners.

Implication 1: The funding formula for this program is on a "per resident" basis and a resident is defined as a young person who spends 30 consecutive nights at the institution, at least one of which is in the month of October of the previous year. Institutions whose usual maximum stay is 30 days (the three runaway shelters and Juvenile Detention) are placed at a disadvantage by this formula compared with institutions whose maximum stay is longer. As a result, these shorter term institutions must either increase their class size or fail to tutor some students because of lack of space in the program.

Implication 2: Since only 11% of the students remained in the program the equivalent of three months or more, a posttest would not be an effective outcome measure for this program.

Implication 3: Surveying tutor and teacher opinion of program benefits is the most effective outcome measure currently available. If access were permitted, however, the results of institutional follow-up efforts would be extremely valuable for the evaluation of this program.